

REMARKS

Claims 1-21, 23-25, 27, and 34-49 are pending in this application. Claims 34 and 45 have been amended to further define the invention. Applicants acknowledge the subject matter indicated as allowable. No new matter has been introduced as a result of these amendments.

Rejections Under 35 USC 102

In light of the amendments to claims 34 and 45, the Applicants respectfully request the removal of the rejections under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,500,858 to McKeown.

Claim 34 includes the features of determining, in a first time slot, a plurality of grants associated with a plurality of arbiters associated with output ports; and determining, in the first time slot, a plurality of grants associated with a plurality of arbiters associated with input ports, wherein the plurality of arbiters associated with output ports and the plurality of arbiters associated with input ports operate in parallel with each other. McKeown operates in a sequential nature and is incapable of operating in parallel as specified in claim 34. Furthermore, the time slot discussed in Figure 9, referenced by the Examiner, is unrelated to the time slot in the present application, as the present application refers to a time slot to indicate that the operations are happening in parallel. The time slot in Figure 9 has to do with the time between activation of the crossbar switch and is unrelated to any parallel processing between two sets of arbiters associated with input and output ports (see column 9, lines 1-16). The Applicants have amended claim 34 to specify

the parallel nature of the present application in order to move further the prosecution of this application. Claims 35-38 are dependent on claim 34 and allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 39 also specifies the features of determining the grant for the first input arbiter being performed in parallel with the determining the grant for the first output arbiter and determining the accept for second output arbiter being performed in parallel with the determining the accept for the second input arbiter. Here again, the parallel nature and the per-input/per-output port basis of the current invention are not disclosed by McKeown, as McKeown is restricted to sequential processing as illustrated in Figure 6. The Examiner has not provided any analysis of the features of determining the grant for the first input arbiter being performed in parallel with the determining the grant for the first output arbiter and determining the accept for second output arbiter being performed in parallel with the determining the accept for the second input arbiter. As mentioned above the reference to a time slot in Figure 9 has nothing to do with parallel processing. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner point out Claims 40 and 41 depend from claim 39 and are allowable for at least the above stated reasons.

Claim 42 also includes the feature that determining for the first input port being performed in parallel with the determining for the first output port. As discussed above, McKeown is incapable of accomplishing this feature and does not disclose this feature. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner point out where in McKeown where the determining of the links for the input ports and the output ports is performed in parallel if this rejection is maintained, as Figure 9 does not refer to any parallel processing and parallel processing would be prohibited due to the structure of McKeown (See Figure 6). Furthermore, in the previous office action claims 43 and 44 were indicated as allowable.

In the present office action claims 43 and 44 are listed as rejected but there is no basis provided for this rejection. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner clarify the status of claim 43 and 44.

Claim 45 has been amended to includes the feature of each first arbiter from the plurality of first arbiters sending its own grant signal to a second arbiter from the plurality of second arbiters during a first time slot, each second arbiter from the plurality of second arbiters sending its own grant signal to a first arbiter from the plurality of first arbiters during the first time slot so that the plurality of first arbiters and the plurality of second arbiters operate in parallel amongst each other and between each other. Here the parallel nature is specified. McKeown does not perform this feature as discussed above and as illustrated in the teaching and Figures of McKeown. Claims 46 and 47 depend from claim 45 and are allowable for at least the above stated reasons.

Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance based on the foregoing remarks. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774 6921. If any other fees are due in connection with filing this amendment, the Commissioner is also

Appl. No. 10/747,658
Amdt. dated August 10, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated February 10, 2006

authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ALTEP034C). A copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael L. Gencarella', written over a horizontal line.

Michael L. Gencarella, Esq.
Reg. No. 44,703

Martine Penilla & Gencarella, LLP
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Tel: (408) 749-6900
Customer Number 45640